227 that they have always had steel hooks. The Kamarakotos use an ingenious device to prevent the fish from cutting the line, analogous to the wire or gut [314] leaders of more civilized fishing. The shaft of the hook is lashed to a stick of wood several centimeters long and the whole coated with balata. I have seen such "leaders" deeply scored by the teeth of fish and obviously they save many [283] cut lines. The line is cotton string and is simply tied to the end of a pole, without any arrangement for reeling or other complications.

Hand nets are of two kinds. The larger, iru?, is used only for scooping [285] out fish already dead or stunned — it is purely a landing net. It is made of heavy double-twisted kurawai fiber knotted in a large square mesh (the weave is described under "Textiles") and as mounted, is about 50 cm. in depth and 20-30 cm. in diameter at the mouth. The throat is smaller and the lower end expands again to a square termination (see Fig. 18 B), an arrangement that tends to keep moribund fish from leaping out. This is mounted on a liana loop, the two ends of which, projecting together, form the handle.[118]

The other net, pendə, is used for live fishing and is much smaller than the iru? (see Fig. 18A). It is only about 15 cm. deep when closed and the open mouth is 10-15 cm. in diameter. It is also of double-twisted kurawai, but the strands are finer and the weave more open than in the iru? (see "Textiles"). It is mounted on a small, very smooth liana frame on which it slides freely. The frame has a short handle and is tied to the end of a long pole for use. When a fish is scooped in, the net slides to the end of the frame and bunches there so that the mouth closes.

226 The fish trap, murui?, (visible in Fig. 9) is made of small cylindrical withes or wicker, (peeled sections of a small, tough vine, tsimo?), tied together into a rectangular mesh (see "Textiles"). The body of the trap is roughly cylindrical with one end terminating in a rigid ring from which flexible withes project freely back into the cylinder, forming a core which will yield and open when a fish enters but which springs back and prevents exit. The other end of the cylinder is left open in weaving and is tied shut when the trap is in use, opened again to remove the fish. The trap is fastened in an opening in a partial dam across a stream and fish are driven into it. Only small fish are so caught.

The favorite and most productive method of fishing is by poison, "barbasco" in Venezuelan Spanish (see Figs. 19-22). There are several different [824] poisons but the most used, the only one that we saw employed, is ine?.[119] This is a vine of which both stem and root are poisonous, the latter more so. Large quantities of this are gathered, cut into sections about 50 cm. in length, [476] bruised by light beating, and tied into bundles. On the chosen day all the Indians of the vicinity gather at the stream to be poisoned and the men take the poison to the most upstream point to be fished. Someone goes a few meters above this point and muddies the water, as a signal and an aid in telling how

118, 119 [see footnotes on pp. 320-21, category 116 - Analyst]

[Text continues on p. 136]

461 would trade his labor for goods for his family rather than for himself. Among
465 the Indians themselves the employment of labor is not uncommon and is paid
[478] either by labor in return or by goods, such as baskets or other common objects of trade. For instance one man may definitely employ another (outside his household — those in the household are of course obligated to help freely) to help erect his house and in return will do an equivalent amount of work for the man employed or will give him an equitable amount of food, drink, or articles of trade. This practice contains the germs of definite class differentiation into employees and laborers, but such differentiation has not at all occurred as yet.
[556] Generally speaking, there is no pronounced difference in wealth between different households and no one man is much more likely to be an employer than an employee.

Crime and Punishment.

173 According to present statements, the ancient penal code of the tribe, if
673 an indefinite and unwritten customary handling of the problem of crime can be
[681] so called, recognized basically only one crime, that of being hopelessly undesirable, and one punishment, death. Judgment as to the undesirability of a
[682] member of the tribe was based on the commission of antisocial actions, among
[685] which unjustified murder, violation of fishing rights, and habitual thievery
173 were specifically mentioned. A household might take matters into its own
692 hands, but this was considered undesirable and the regular, one might say the
643 truly legal, procedure was to lay the complaint before the cacique who judged
[627] its accuracy and gravity, but apparently without holding anything resembling
[696] a formal hearing or trial. If he condemned the criminal, he assigned the duty of executing him to any members of the tribe, such as the male complainants, and the sentence was carried out without further formality as soon as opportunity presented.

674 At present, the Indians say, crime is so nearly unknown that no regular
[681] system of punishment is required. It is easy to believe that serious crime is
[157] extremely rare as the amity of the Kamarakotos is amazing. Even when they
[273] were violently drunk no quarreling was seen, still less any attempts at physical injury. They are, however, human and it is incredible that no crime ever is
[178] committed. From answers to hypothetical questions as to what would be done if a crime should occur, it is evident that the old code is still considered natural and just and I have no doubt that it would be, and probably is, still applied if
685 occasion arises. Specifically, it was stated that unprovoked murder and serious
[682] violation of fishing rights merit death and that this should be administered un-
[696] der direction of the cacique but might well be undertaken by the injured house-
[627] hold on its own initiative. Theft, on the other hand, is now considered theoretically (and probably also in practice although no specific instance could be